

A
A
0
0
0
9
4
2
0
7
2
0



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

ROBINSON
Speech in Exposition of New
Hampshire Democracy

California
Regional
Facility

F
38
R6

S P E E C H
OF
WILLIAM E. ROBINSON,
IN EXPOSITION OF
NEW HAMPSHIRE DEMOCRACY
IN ITS RELATIONS TO
CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION,
INCLUDING A
SCRUTINY OF THE PART TAKEN WITH REFERENCE THERETO,
BY
GEN. FRANKLIN PIERCE.
AND
AN EXPOSURE
OF THE
FALSE PRETENCES AND FALSE ASSERTIONS
OF
GEO. M. DALLAS AND OTHERS.
RESPECTING THE
ACTION OF THE WHIGS OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED AT THE TRIBUNE OFFICE,
154 NASSAU STREET.
1852.

PRICE \$10 PER THOUSAND, \$1.25 PER HUNDRED, 2 CENTS A SINGLE COPY



SPEECH

OF

WILLIAM E. ROBINSON,

ON

NEW-HAMPSHIRE DEMOCRACY AND CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.

At a large and spirited meeting of the SCOTT and GRAHAM Clubs of the IVth Congressional District of this City, held at the North American Hotel on Friday evening last, (Aug. 6,) WM. E. ROBINSON, Esq. of this City, spoke as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON said he had just returned from Concord, New-Hampshire, where he had examined the fountains of Democracy. He referred to the speech made by George M. Dallas, in the Museum at Philadelphia, June 7, '52, in which that gentleman said:

"The aspersion against Pierce of having favored the Catholic test, still retained in the Constitution of New-Hampshire is a weak invention of a frightened enemy. He said it was true such a provision, excluding Catholics from occupying a seat in the Legislature or becoming Governor, was engrafted on the Constitution of that State, but it was also true that Levi Woodbury and Franklin Pierce had obtained the passage of laws providing for the holding of two State Conventions to amend that Constitution. In both cases an amended Constitution was submitted to the vote of the People, but a two-third vote being requisite, it was defeated by a combination of Whigs and Abolitionists."

Mr. Robinson also quoted from the speech of Charles O'Connor, of this City, made in Tammany Hall, on the evening of June 9, and published in *The Truth-Teller* of July 3, in which he said that Franklin Pierce comes recommended

"By all his antecedents and all his connections. He is the son of Benjamin Pierce. * * * He (Franklin Pierce) and his political associates brought forward an amendment abolishing this (the Anti-Catholic) unjust—this odious distinction. * * * By means of his zealous advocacy, this benign reform was adopted by the Convention. He also advocated it at the polls. * * * When religious liberty needed a champion, he was found in Franklin Pierce."

Mr. R. also referred to the assertion of Mr. O'Connor, that his latest information was from Franklin Pierce, who expressed a strong hope that Catholic emancipation had been or would be carried in New-Hampshire, and said that these assertions of Messrs. Dallas and O'Connor were now received throughout the country, and unfortunately some Whig papers, deceived by the respectability of the authority, had joined in receiving them as acknowledged public opinion, though there was not one word of truth in either assertion.

EIGHT PROPOSITIONS.

On the contrary, Mr. Robinson laid down the following propositions, and so earnest was he in challenging an investigation, that he announced that he would deposit, in the hands of Simeon Draper, one hundred dollars to be

forfeited and given up to any one that would prove that in any one of these propositions he misstated the facts. The decision to be left to Robert Emmet.

1. Franklin Pierce did not speak at all in favor of Catholic Emancipation during the whole time the Catholic test was before the Convention.

2. He had nothing to do with "bringing forward" the subject. The resolution abolishing the test was drawn up by Mr. Parker, of Nashua, a *Whig*, and was "brought forward" by Mr. Parker Nov. 13, when it was discussed in Convention.

3. It was known throughout New-Hampshire that Catholic Emancipation was finally defeated by an overwhelming vote some eight or ten weeks before Mr. O'Connor spoke in Tammany Hall.

4. When Religious Liberty needed a champion Gen. Pierce was found—wanting. Though after Catholic Emancipation had been carried in Convention he found time, while making a speech on the Property Qualification, to excuse and apologise for the test bigotry by saying it was a dead letter and a blank, which was simply stating that Catholics would perjure themselves to get into office, by swearing to support a Constitution which expressly shut them out.

5. That so far from all his "antecedents" being right, his father, Benjamin Pierce, voted to put the anti-Catholic clause into the Constitution, and voted for the Alien and Sedition Laws of old John Adams!

6. That so far from Catholic Emancipation falling only for want of a two-thirds vote, it had not one-sixth of the votes cast throughout the State at the same election for Governor, and did not come near a simple majority of the small vote cast on this question.

7. That in place of there being any high confidence in New-Hampshire of Catholic Emancipation being carried, the general opinion is, that unless we draw a line around New-Hampshire, anyling, that while the plague-spot is on her, and the ship is unpurified, no man, captain nor crew, shall land, and thus, by the defeat of General Pierce, bring his bigoted party to their senses, the Catholics in that State stand no chance of being Emancipated for half a century.

8. And in a word, in fine, that the father, Benjamin Pierce, was a red hot enemy of the Catholics, and a supporter of the Alien and Sedition acts, and that Franklin Pierce, the young chicken, so learned to follow the old one that he raised not a voice in favor of abolishing his father's bigotry, during the whole time the subject was under discussion in a Convention of which he was a leading member and President.

Mr. Robinson referred to the fact that in the *Loco-Fo-*

co Baltimore Convention there were some thirteen candidates found with marks of popular favor upon them.

TWO-THIRDS DEMOCRACY.

A dog in hydrophobia could not have manifested more rage at the sight of water than these aristocratic Baltimore Delegates exhibited toward everything on which was the mark of popular favor. Nor did the "phobia" get off till every vestige of popular favor was removed from their sight, and buried beneath the aristocratic device of a two-thirds rule. And then a shout went up, not that anybody had won, but that everybody had been defeated, and that everybody's favorite was dead.

THE OLD CANT.

Mr. Robinson disclaimed any wish to use epithets, but he knew that the whole political capital of the Pierce party was hogus; and without intending to apply the epithet to any one, when he found a falsehood or a forgery he would call it so. If he did not expose falsehood and forgery, he would be false to his native and adopted countries, and false to the cause of true republicanism. He had labored through 12 years of his life in this country, with all the strength which God had given him, to tread down all sorts of bigotry, political and religious, and he would continue in the same path in despite of all the abuse and misrepresentation which he had already met and would yet have to encounter from some unprincipled presses to which he referred, but which he said scorned—the rusted shafts of calumny falling from impenetrable shield.

He referred to the forgery and falsehood with which naturalized citizens were appealed to against Harrison and Taylor, which history has proved to be false, as history will yet prove the charges against Gen. Scott false. He pictured the blood-bound venom with which these same pack of slanderers hunted Henry Clay into a grave which even their superhuman malignity could not rob of its transcendent glory, and around which these same blood-nounds, now changed into crocodiles, pretend to shed oceans of tears at the death of one who, while living, they tried to make naturalized citizens believe was worthy of a dog's burial in place of posthumous honors. To what lengths must our patience be abused as naturalized citizens? How long shall we be insulted by being put to draw the water with which to drown, or hew the wood with which to consume the altars reared in American hearts to a Clay and a Scott, to raise in their stead altars to the *idola* of a Polk and a Pierce? How long will it be expected that we shall palsy or break the arm that humbled the pride of England, to raise and sustain the arm which refused to move a muscle to remove the disgrace which the elder Pierce had fastened on the neck of all but one sect in New-Hampshire?

One great falsehood of this Campaign is saying that Franklin Pierce advocated Catholic Emancipation when it was before the late New-Hampshire Convention. The great forgery of the Campaign is the pretended letter of Gen. Scott to George W. Reed, on Nativism.

NEW-HAMPSHIRE CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY.

And here Mr. R. gave a sketch of the Constitutional History of New-Hampshire. He said:

The first Constitution was formed in Exeter in 1776, and was called the "Temporary Constitution." I read it in manuscript, and found in it no anti-Catholic test, so that we had no bigotry till after the Revolution. This Temporary Constitution continued for eight years and six months.

In 1778, a Convention was called to meet at Concord, and submitted the form of a Constitution to the people in 1779, and that was rejected. Another was formed and submitted in 1781, and that also was rejected. Another was formed in 1782, and that too was rejected. A fourth form was agreed upon, and this was accepted by a two-thirds vote. It was known as the "New Constitution."

This continued in force till 1792, when another Constitution was adopted, which still continues in force, and is the one to amend which the attempt was made in 1850-52, and this is called "The Revised Constitution."

CONSTITUTION OF 1792.

And this brings us to the opening of the Pierce dynasty

in New-Hampshire. We shall find, henceforth, the name of Pierce and bigotry concomitant.

The Convention to revise the New Constitution met at Concord, September 7, 1791. Among its members, I find several of the old Revolutionary names, and prominent among them Maj. Benjamin Pierce, (as he is put down,) of Hillsborough, the father of Franklin Pierce. I find also, Jeremiah Smith, of Peterborough, Aaron Greeley, of Hopkinton, Major Caleb Stark, of Dunbarton and Bow, &c. Samuel Livermore, of Holderness, was chosen President, and John Calfe, of Hampstead, Secretary.

On the second day of the session, a motion was made to strike out the sixth article (as it now stands) in the Bill of Rights, providing for "the support and maintenance of the public Protestant teachers." The yeas were 14, (Greeley, Stark, Whipple, Ilutchina, &c., among the yeas.) The Nays were 88, and BENJAMIN PIERCE, Franklin's father, and Charles O'Connor's respected and confided-in "antecedent," voted against Religious Liberty.

September 10, the fourth day of the Convention, a motion was made to strike out from section 14, under form of government (as it now stands) prescribing qualifications for members of the House of Representatives, the words "*shall be of the Protestant Religion.*" Upon this the Yeas and Nays were taken: Yeas for Religious Liberty 33, and among them Jeremiah Smith, Aaron Greeley, William Plumer, Caleb Stark, &c. Nays, for the Penal Laws and Anti-Popery, 51, and among them BENJAMIN PIERCE, Franklin's father, and Charles O'Connor's favorite antecedent. A form of a Constitution was finally agreed upon, and was ordered to be submitted to the people on the first Monday in May, 1792, and the Convention adjourned till the 30th of the same month.

On the first day of June, 1792, the votes of the people were counted, and it was found that some parts of the constitution were accepted, and some parts rejected, for want of a two-thirds vote, (that Loco-Foco two-third rule is an awful thing!) and it further appeared that some of the propositions rejected were necessary to make sense of those accepted, so that a committee, appointed to bring order out of that confusion, reported that the parts accepted and approved by the people "were inconsistent with the constitution and with each other," yet, as the people had accepted them, nobody could dare despoil them.

The report of the Convention which I examined is a volume, partly in manuscript and partly in print, which is preserved with great care in the Secretary of State's office; but it does not give the precise form in which the clauses rejected were submitted to the people. It seems, however, that notwithstanding Pierce's anti-Popery penal votes, the term Protestant was omitted in the qualifications for some offices for which, it is probable, they were rejected. Be this as it may, a committee was appointed to recommend what new amendments should be adopted to please the people. That committee reported pretty much the same old dish, rehashed and additionally peppered with Protestantism and property, to suit the taste of the Pierce epicures, and was submitted again to the people on the 27th of August, 1792.

SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE.

The Convention met finally at Concord, September 5, 1792, when the votes were counted, and it was found that the whole number of votes cast was 3,100, of which 2,122 were for, and 978 against the Constitution. It was thus carried by about 55 votes more than the necessary two-thirds vote, so that if there had been only 28 additional votes against this bigoted and disgraceful Constitution, it would have been defeated.

It is remarkable that on the vote on this Constitution, excluding Catholics from office, some of the towns that are now Whig voted very decidedly against it. Thus the Whig town of Exeter gave 59 votes against it and not one for it. The Whig town of Dover gave 43 votes against it and only 24 for it. While the Loco Foco town of Gilmanton gave 41 votes for it and not one against it. The Loco Foco town of New-Durham gave 14 votes for it and not one against it. The Loco Foco town of Hillsborough—Benjamin Pierce's adopted town, and of which he was the Representative, and Franklin Pierce's native town, and which he afterward represented in the Legislature—gave 16 for it and not one

against it. Had it been necessary for some Dallas to make an excuse for the adoption of that Constitution, he would have said that it was owing to some mysterious combination of cyphers like the above that prevented the two-third union from defeating themselves.

There's the record, as I found it in a carefully preserved book in the office of the Secretary of State at Concord, in New-Hampshire, and there's the commendable "antececedent" of Franklin Pierce.

WHAT IS THIS CONSTITUTION?

And thus was formed the Constitution which is now in full force in one of the States of our American Union, which claims that the American people must, by a two-thirds rule, kill off Cass, Buchanan and Douglas to make room for the son of the father who framed that bigoted instrument, and for the leader of the party which refuses to exert itself for its modification.

There are two or three points in this Constitution to which I wish to draw public attention. I copy from the official copy printed in 1852 by the State printers:

BILL OF RIGHTS. Section 6 authorizes the towns, &c. to make provision "for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality."

FORM OF GOVERNMENT.—Section 14. "Every member of the House of Representatives * * * shall be of the Protestant religion, and shall cease to represent such town, parish or place immediately on ceasing to be qualified as aforesaid."

Section 29. "Provided, nevertheless, that no person shall be capable of being elected a Senator who is not of the Protestant religion."

Section 42. "The Governor * * * shall be of the Protestant religion."

Section 61. "And the qualification for Counsellors shall be the same as for Senator."

Sec. 99. It shall be the duty of the Selectmen and Assessors of the several towns and places in this State, in warning the first annual meetings for the choice of Senators, after the expiration of seven years from the adoption of this Constitution, as amended, to insert expressly in the warrant this purpose, among the others, for the meeting, to wit: to take the sense of the qualified voters on the subject of a revision of the Constitution; and the meeting being warned accordingly, and not otherwise, the moderator shall take the sense of the qualified voters present as to the necessity of a revision; and a return of the number of votes for and against such necessity shall be made by the Clerk, sealed up and directed to the General Court at their then next session; and if it shall appear to the General Court by such return, that the sense of the people of the State has been taken, and that in the opinion of the majority of the qualified voters in the State, present and voting at said meeting, there is a necessity for a revision of the Constitution, it shall be the duty of the General Court to call a Convention for that purpose; otherwise the General Court shall direct the sense of the people to be taken, and then proceed in the manner before mentioned. The delegates to be chosen in the same manner, and proportioned as the Representatives to the General Court; provided, that no alterations shall be made in this Constitution before the same shall be laid before the towns and unincorporated places, and approved by two-thirds of the qualified voters present and voting on the subject.

Sec. 100. And the same method of taking the sense of the people as to a revision of the Constitution, and calling a Convention for that purpose, shall be observed afterwards, at the expiration of every seven years.

HONEST OPINIONS ON IT.

Now, then, here is the Constitution of the State of New-Hampshire, festering in its bigotry in religion and aristocracy in property, under the blaze of the noon of the 19th century, and unchanged, and without attempt to change it, from 1792 to 1850; and yet for over half a century—during which time Benj. Pierce was member of the Legislature, Counsellor and Governor, and Franklin Pierce, for a period of over twenty years, was the leading man of the party in power, member of the Legislature, (the same year his father was Governor,) and Speaker of the House of Representatives the two succeeding years—for over a dreary half century of penal laws, no member of the Pierce family made one single speech urging the justice of Catholic emancipation. Nay, more, it will be seen that a bare majority of the people could have ordered the Constitution amended every seventh year by a simple majority, and were bound to vote every seventh year whether the Constitution should be amended. Four times did these seven year trials occur since Franklin Pierce was elected a member

and Speaker of the House of Representatives, yet dumb as an oyster and dark as a dungeon did he keep himself. Thus did he champion the cause of Religious Liberty. Well may every Catholic say to Mr. Pierce in the language of Israel's inspired Prophet—"Because I have called and ye refused. * * * I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh."

Let us see what this New-Hampshire enormity is. It is an enormity in the eyes of all men, not only Catholics, but liberal Republicans of all sects. It is the penal and test idea of the House of Brunswick and Guelph. It is the enormity which the British Tory Administration of Peel and Wellington abolished for Irish Catholics in 1829, when Franklin Pierce first took his seat in the New-Hampshire Legislature. New-Hampshire Loco Focoism remains to-day more bigoted and besotted than British Toryism was 23 years ago, and Lord Roden, Treham Gregg or Lord John Russell has stronger claims than Franklin Pierce has to true Republican votes, for their parties (Tories though they be) opened the door of the British Parliament to Catholics, while New-Hampshire refuses to open her Legislature. If Thomas Francis Meagher should get naturalized there, if Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, the last living signer of our Declaration of Independence had chosen to reside there, or if our present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Hon. Roger B. Taney, should choose to live there, one and all would be excluded from the right to a seat in the New-Hampshire two-penny Legislature, unless they perjured themselves, or foreswore their creed—and this is the kind of Democracy which every man endorses who votes for Franklin Pierce, the leader of that Democracy in New-Hampshire whom the Loco-Foco Press informs us it was intended to compliment by his nomination. Well might Judge Woodbury say, as he did in the New-Hampshire Constitutional Convention, that this New-Hampshire enormity branded the Catholic, "though educated, and talented, and virtuous, with infamy and disgrace, and sent him and his family through our streets and social circles, marked like Cain, as a sort of degraded outcast or helot, not fit to be intrusted with either legislative or executive rights, though bestowed fully on the most ignorant and reprobate."

PIERCE'S OPINION OF IT.

Such was the opinion of Judge Woodbury, such is the opinion of every honest republican of every sect. Now what has been Franklin Pierce's denunciation of the enormity? Did he concur with Judge Woodbury in denouncing it as a disgrace?

Truly, no. We are told that old Benjamin Pierce got Franklin Pierce to write his messages, as he could not even spell the word "but." This is quite likely. Well, Franklin Pierce was a member of the Legislature in 1829. In June, 1829, Benjamin Pierce, being Governor of the State, sent in his annual message to the House of Representatives, of which this Franklin Pierce was a leading member. Well, this Franklin Pierce, in that annual message of his father, said, just after swearing to a constitution which excludes Catholics from the four principal offices of the State:

"To look abroad and behold every citizen, without distinction of sect or rank, exercising the full and equal rights of civil and religious liberty (?) are alone sufficient to excite emotions of gratitude too strong ever to be obliterated."

Here Franklin Pierce put it into the mouth of his father, the Governor, to insult deliberately every lover of truth, equal rights and Republican liberality, by saying that his emotions of gratitude were too strong ever to be obliterated in glorying in that bogus system of equal rights which marked the most numerous Christian sect in Christendom with the disgrace of the helot and the mark of Cain. Why should the people of New-Hampshire change their Constitution when the leader of the Democracy of that State then, and the leader of the Democracy of the United States now, saw the Catholics branded as outcasts and helots, and excluded from offices open to the negroes, with feelings of gratitude "too strong ever to be obliterated."

There is Franklin Pierce's idea of championing Religious Liberty—that a State where a Catholic cannot hold an office, even should the whole people of the State vote for him, is such a political Paradise that admiration burns it so deeply into his affections that time cannot obliterate the record.

This Constitution has been in existence sixty years. Eight times since, has it been submitted to the People, whether it should be reformed, and never has the dominant party in the State made it a test of principle. Never has Franklin Pierce called a meeting to denounce the bigotry. The vote in the eye of the Rhode Island Constitution they viewed through a magnifying glass, in the Dorr Rebellion. They reversed the instrument when examining the beam in their own

CONSTITUTION CONVENTION OF 1850-52.

I now beg your attention to the history of the effort made for Catholic Emancipation in New Hampshire in 1850-52. In the March election of 1850, the question was submitted to the people of the State, whether a Convention to reform the Constitution should be called. It was carried by a majority of the votes cast, but if it had depended on Pierce's party, it would have failed. Two or three Whig towns, compared with a few Loco-Foco towns, will suffice to show this. I give the votes for and against calling the Convention, and the vote for the Whig and Loco-Foco candidates, at the general election the same year, (1850):

WHIG TOWNS.				
ON CONVENTION.		ON GOVERNOR.		
Towns.	Yeas.	Nays.	Whig.	Loco
Dover.....	447	98	619	504
Somerworth.....	201	59	361	186
Keene.....	281	64	345	199
LOCO-FOCO TOWNS.				
Northwood.....	64	132	30	157
Nottingham.....	54	132	17	124
Albany.....	7	84	16	57
Brookfield.....	16	90	9	58
Strafford.....	3	163	147	271
Warner.....	67	168	26	320
Ellsworth.....	7	60	6	49

COMPARISON OF VOTES.

Here Whig Dover gives nearly five to one for the Convention; Loco-Foco Albany twelve to one against it; Whig Somerworth gives nearly four to one for it; Loco-Foco Strafford sixty-one to one against it; Whig Keene gives over four to one for it; Loco-Foco Ellsworth eight to one against it! Yet Hon. Geo. M. Dallas says the Whigs and Free-Sollers combined to defeat the benevolent intentions of the Pierce party!

In the Whig town of Keene it will be seen there were but 199 votes for the Pierce Governor, but there were 281 votes for Constitutional reform; while in the town of Ellsworth, where there were only six Whig votes, all told, there were sixty votes against Constitutional Reform—that is, ten times as many votes against it as there are Whig votes in the whole town. But what use in summoning up a storm of argument or a wave of testimony to wait a feather or to drown a lie? In the town of Ellsworth the figures indicate that the whole Whig vote with one Free-Soller, went for Constitutional Reform, and the entire Loco-Foco vote with the remainder of the Free-Sollers, went for keeping the mark of Cain upon the Catholics.

CONVENTION MEETS.

But notwithstanding Locofoco opposition, the Convention was called, and met in Concord, on the 6th day of November, 1850. Franklin Pierce was elected from Concord, and was chosen President of the Convention. In his speech on taking the Chair, in place of speaking a kind word in favor of Catholic Emancipation, he passed a glowing eulogy on the wisdom, enlightenment, purity, and patriotism, of those who, in 1792, fastened the stigma on the Catholics. Thus, when religious liberty needed a champion, Franklin Pierce, from the Chair of a Convention called to reform the abuse, had not one word to say against the iniquity but honeyed phrases for those who made it. (See *Concord Patriot*, Nov. 7.)

The *Patriot*, Pierce's organ, then and now, (and hereafter, should he be elected,) had a leading editorial on the Convention the day it met, but not one word in favor of Catholic Emancipation. On the contrary, it warned the Convention to "be careful to do no more than the people require." The people showed that they did not require Catholic Emancipation, as not one-sixth of the voters afterward voted for it.

November 11, 1850, Judge Woodbury made a motion

to strike out the word "Protestant" from the Bill of Rights. On the same day, Franklin Pierce made a speech in favor of retaining the word *subject*, instead of *citizen* or *inhabitant*, in the Constitution, but this "zealous champion" had not a word to say in favor of Judge Woodbury's motion.

ANTI-CATHOLIC TEST.

Mr. Bell, of Gilford, moved to strike out the whole of the sixth clause, except the proviso, which reads as follows:

"As morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles, will give the best and greatest security to Government, and will lay in the hearts of men the strongest obligations to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion, therefore, to promote those important purposes, the people of this State have a right to empower, and do hereby fully empower, the Legislature to authorize from time to time the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies within this State, to make adequate provision, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality."

Franklin Pierce, of Concord, warmly opposed this, in a speech of which the following is a brief report, given officially in *The Concord Patriot* of November 12:

"Mr. Pierce, of Concord, said he would be sorry to have the question taken upon the motion of the gentleman from Gilford, (Mr. Bell), to strike out all the sixth article but the last clause of the proviso. He was sure the mover would, upon reflection, desire to retain the first part of that article, on every ground, and especially as the deliberate expression of opinion of wise and patriotic men of a past generation, (his father, &c.), upon the question as to what "will give the best and greatest security to Government." He believed that what was so forcibly expressed in the Constitution of '92, would be solemnly reaffirmed as the deliberative, unanimous judgment of this Convention."

Now, here is the only speech he made on the test, and if that is not indorsing the Anti-Catholic clauses, framed by his father, I do not know what language means.

Nov. 12, *The Patriot* again had an article, warning the Convention not to make any amendments but such as are clearly indicated by the people.

PIERCE AGAINST REFORM.

In Convention, Nov. 12, the Committee on Religious and Property Tests, reported in favor of their repeal. The sixth article, as above, was taken up. Franklin Pierce said: "It was his earnest desire to retain not only ALL the principles, but, as far as practicable, the language of this section." He spoke in favor of retaining the word "Evangelical," which is generally applied to the church which he attends in Concord. He spoke several times during the day, but not one single argument did he produce or hint at in favor of Catholic emancipation.

The same day, Franklin Pierce spoke upon the Judiciary. Indeed he seemed anxious to "spread himself" upon almost every subject but upon his father's Anti-Catholic policy.

THE DECISIVE DISCUSSION.

The great and decisive discussion on the Anti-Catholic Test came off on Nov. 13. I might remark here that the fulsome nonsense going the rounds of the Loco-Foco papers that Mr. Pierce descended from the President's chair, &c., is nothing but nonsense, and nonsense of a very ridiculous stripe. The discussion took place in Committee of the Whole, and the President was not in the chair at all! The Chair on this day (Nov. 13) was occupied by Mr. Sawyer, of Nashua. The first resolution was to strike out all religious tests, and Judge Woodbury made a long speech upon it. He contended that, in the Bill of Rights, all were made equal, and yet all but Protestants are made unequal: "You hold out the husk, but withhold the kernel; you allow fire-arms, but neither gunpowder nor lead to load them."

He contended that "all other than Protestant sects are virtually deprived of representation as they are made ineligible to the Legislature. Their opinions and wishes are unheard there from themselves. They are branded, they are driven forth as with the mark of Cain, for servitude and ignominy!" He continued, "Indeed this test debars man from what we allow to the degraded African, as he is eligible here to hold office as well as to vote. While the present test continues," said he, "it is with

an ill grace we can call other countries bigoted, who like England, have emancipated the Catholics."

Mr. Parker, of Nashua, followed, and contended that there was no opposition to striking out the test.

Mr. Robinson, of Salisbury, followed in favor of abolishing the test, and it passed in Committee of the Whole without opposition, and without one single remark from Franklin Pierce in its favor.

What then shall we say of the speech, now going the rounds of the papers, attributed to Franklin Pierce, which, we are told, he left the chair, (which he did not occupy,) to make? I am sorry that I am compelled to expose here one of the meanest tricks ever resorted to, to defraud and deceive the people.

A CUNNING DODGE.

As soon as it was known that Franklin Pierce was nominated at Baltimore, the liberal-minded men of all sects, and particularly the naturalized citizens, declared that unless it could be proved that Franklin Pierce had advocated or favored the repeal of the Catholic disability, they would not vote for him. When Mr. Dallas spoke in Philadelphia, the very next week-day evening after the nomination of Mr. Pierce, he could not have seen any public charge made against Mr. Pierce, for neglect of duty in this respect. But as the inspired Proverbialist informs us, "The wicked flee when no man pursueth," he stated that Franklin Pierce had advocated the repeal of the Anti-Catholic test. On searching the records, no speech from Mr. Pierce could be found, but it was decided on, that something in the shape of a speech should be, *ex post facto*, put into his mouth. Some dodge must be resorted to, and the leaders seemed to say any dodge, however despicable, will be good enough for the Catholics, who won't know the difference. The telegraph soon informed us that *The Washington Union* would, the next morning, contain the speech of Franklin Pierce on this subject, which he condescended to make, and even descended from the chair to deliver.

Though the speech was first published in *The Washington Union* and copied into *The Ohio Statesman* of June 16, yet the dodge, I believe, was concocted in Concord, and, I cannot help thinking, by the assistance of Franklin Pierce himself. Accordingly *The Concord Patriot*, of June 17, 1852, contains the speech which was to gull and deceive every liberal-minded naturalized citizen, and so far the forgery has succeeded admirably. On referring to the official report of the proceedings in *The Concord Patriot*, I found that Franklin Pierce had not spoken at all upon the subject; but on looking further I found that after the Religious test had been abolished without opposition, and laid aside as completed, and the Property test coming up, Franklin Pierce made a speech in favor of striking out the property test, and in that speech the only reference he made to the religious test, was that it had been a "dead letter." And though it had been a "stigma" upon the State, he referred to other parts of the Constitution to excuse their fathers' bigotry. Indeed, he contended that the great question of religious toleration was settled; which, if it meant anything, meant that there was no necessity to bother the Convention about making any alterations on that subject.

When these remarks were made, the Religious test was not before the Convention. That subject had been definitively acted on. (See official report in *The Concord (N. H.) Patriot*, of Nov. 14, 1850, and compare it with June 17, 1852, to see the juggle and trick of a reckless set of partisans.)

PLAUSIBLE DECEPTION.

But to give plausibility to the forgery, for forgery it is, at the conclusion of Woodbury's speech on the Religious tests, six stars are printed. Now, when stars are introduced, it always means that a part of the speech is omitted of no importance. But in this case, those six stars, which are printed in Woodbury's speech, now going the rounds of the Loco-Foco papers, come in between the conclusion of Woodbury's speech on the Religious tests and the closing sentence of his speech on the property qualification. Those six stars are all we have for the speeches of Messrs. Parker and Robinson, the decisive votes on the Religious tests, the taking up of another subject, and Judge Woodbury's speech, of nearly a whole column, on that other subject; and thus, by the magic influence of those stars, joining the duo-

declino speech of Pierce on property qualification to the folio speech of Woodbury on the Religious test. These tricksters hope to leave the impression on the public mind that both were made upon the same subject, and that it was after Pierce's "powerful" speech that the vote was carried! The enemy, however, was conquered, and had capitulated to the artillery of Woodbury, before Pierce discharged his pop-gun. And yet, by this shallow device, these forgers hope to blind the eyes of the citizens interested, and to cheat them out of their votes, in support of a candidate whose conduct they must despise. Since the time when an infernal home was opened for outcast villainy, has any rascality meaner and more stupid than this been perpetrated?

OTHER VOTES AND TRIALS.

The question which had been decided in Committee of the Whole afterward came before the Convention. Mr. Cass of Holderness, a Loco-Foco friend of Franklin Pierce, and, I believe, a relative of Lewis Cass, of Michigan, spoke against Catholic Emancipation. So, also, did Mr. Brewster, of Dutton, (a Loco-Foco,) and Mr. Wingate, of Stratham, (also a Loco-Foco.) Franklin Pierce descended not from his chair, but put the question, and it was carried, with only 7 Nays. The names are not given, but I believe the whole seven were political friends of Franklin Pierce.

Nov. 14. Franklin Pierce made two speeches on giving the election of Judges to the people. Like everything else from him, it was non-committal; but the effect of his remarks was in opposition to the election by the people.

Nov. 18. The question was taken whether the word "Protestant" should be stricken from the qualifications of Representatives. Carried—but not a word from Franklin Pierce.

Nov. 19. The question was taken on striking the word "Protestant" from the qualification for Senators. Carried, on a division, "several members voting in the negative." Franklin Pierce still silent on Catholic Emancipation, though he found time, the same day, without descending from the chair, to make four or five speeches on minor matters—one of them nearly a column long.

Dec. 4. The question was taken on striking the word "Protestant" from the qualifications for Governor. Mr. Cass spoke against it; several members voting in the negative. No word from Franklin Pierce. Judge Woodbury was absent, attending Court at Washington, and there was nobody to speak for the Catholics; but Mr. Pierce found time to make three speeches on the basis of representation during the evening session of that day.

Dec. 5. Mr. Franklin Pierce made another speech on representation.

ABJURATION OATH PROPOSED.

Dec. 9. Mr. Cass offered the following resolution: Resolved, That an article be inserted in the Constitution as follows: "No one who is bound by the oath of allegiance to any monarchical or foreign power whatever, or who is bound by his religious faith to put down free toleration, shall at any time hold any office of trust or profit in the State."

Dec. 10. The President, Franklin Pierce, decided that Mr. Cass's resolution, as reported above, was in order. Now, here was a chance for Mr. Pierce to descend from the Chair.

Mr. Cass (Loco-Foco) asked: "Was it safe to elect a man Governor who was sworn to the Pope of Rome, and believed that all Protestants were heretics, and should be persecuted unto death? He would not have it left open so that persecutors could come in and take the helm of Government. He thought it right to put up the bars. Was it ever known that Catholics gained the power over any people, and got the Government into their own hands, that they did not persecute, even unto death, all that were opposed to them? And was it not their religion, though they might be bound by all the oaths that could be imposed on them, that they might be absolved by the Pope? And were they not striving for conquest everywhere, and to set up their religion of Church and State? * * * Were not nunneries and Catholic schools springing up all around us? And were they not teaching the children that we are all heretics? * * * And should Ireland be free from England to-day, would she sustain a Republic? No. Let Ireland be free from England, and the Pope

would have the power. And would he sustain a Republic? Look to Mexico," &c.

Mr. Richardson, (Loco-Foco,) of Hanover, followed Mr. Case, and spoke against the resolution, but took occasion to have a fling at the Catholics. He said: "It was idle to suppose that a narrow-minded Jesuit should be elevated to office. * * * In this country, with its liberalizing influence, we had no reason to fear anything from Catholics."

Other speeches followed on the same question, and I submit to Mr. O'Connor whether this was not an occasion when religious liberty needed a champion?

PIERCE FAILS TO DEFEND.

Did Franklin Pierce jump from his chair to answer his two friends? Did he rule Case's resolution out of order, as he might have done? No; he opened not his mouth against it, though one might suppose that Judge Woodbury being absent, the mantle of religious championship would fall upon him. He quietly put the question, and the resolution was indefinitely postponed. During that same day, however, he found time to make another speech on the everlasting question of Representation, occupying nearly a column in the official report.

The Concord Patriot of Dec. 13, speaking of this Representation amendment, calls it "the most important amendment proposed." This declaration, by the official organ of Franklin Pierce and printer to the Convention, showed that the party attributed very little importance to the religious test. In fact, Pierce and his party adopted a system of Representation similar to the rotten borough system of Great Britain, for no other apparent reason than to defeat all amendments of the Constitution.

FOREIGNERS NOT PEOPLE.

Dec. 12, Gov. Steele, (Loco,) on this subject of the basis of Representation, moved that paupers and foreigners be not counted as part of the people.

Mr. Case complained that "two towns, during the building of the Northern Railroad, had sent two extra representatives on the score of the Irishmen at work on this road." (Awful!)

Here now was a glorious chance for the champion of Catholics and Irishmen, but Mr. Franklin Pierce was dumb, and Gov. Steele's amendment was carried by 102 to 63.

Dec. 13. In the evening the religious test on representation was stricken out, but no remarks from Mr. Pierce.

PIERCE ON OTHER MATTERS.

Dec. 19. Franklin Pierce spoke two or three times on the Judiciary. In fact, Catholic Emancipation seemed to be the only subject on which his tongue was tied.

Dec. 24. Franklin Pierce spoke on the calling out of the militia.

Dec. 26. Franklin Pierce opposed the election of clerks of the Courts by the people, and had that clause stricken out. The same day he spoke several times on the election and jurisdiction of petty Judges. No subject was too petty for his tongue but Catholic Emancipation.

Dec. 27. Franklin Pierce opposed districting the State into twenty Senatorial Districts, on the ground that it would endanger his party's superiority, and it was defeated. The same evening he spoke four or five times on Petty Justices' Courts.

CONCLUSION OF THE SESSION.

The Convention finally adjourned on the 3d day of January, 1851, and during its whole session Franklin Pierce found time to speak on almost every subject, trivial, petty, State and National, and that, too, without descending from the Chair, but never once during the whole session of the Convention, while the religious test was before the Convention, did he say one word in favor of striking it out.

And yet every lying sheet and Loco-Foco mouth is full of fulsome praises on Franklin Pierce for doing what he never did! What dependence, then, can naturalized citizens place upon anything these people say?

SUBMITTED TO THE PEOPLE.

The question was submitted to the people at the regular election held in New-Hampshire on the second Tues-

day of March, 1851. During the whole of that time, from January to March, no public meeting was called by Mr. Pierce or his friends to speak in favor of Catholic Emancipation. They did not, he did not give himself as much trouble to rescue the Catholics from their disabilities as a common humane person would take to extricate a fly from the meshes of a spider's web.

The amendments were submitted in the form of fifteen questions, and the repeal of the anti-Catholic test was No. 8. Let us look at a few of the towns to see the unblushing effrontery of Geo. M. Dallas and the whole Loco-Foco party. I take these returns from The Concord Patriot, of March 27, 1851, which says, in announcing the result: "Every proposition submitted has been rejected by a very large majority." Geo. M. Dallas says it was rejected for want of a two-thirds vote!

THE VOTE.

I have given the vote in the same towns, the same year, for Dinmore, the Pierce candidate, a man whom Franklin Pierce had put up against Atwood, the regular Loco-Foco candidate. It will be seen that in towns where Franklin Pierce rallied his party to vote by hundreds for his candidate, he did not think it worth while to secure a single baker's dozen for Catholic Emancipation. Here are a few towns.

On the eighth proposition, as voted for in March, 1851, with votes for Governor given at the same election, from The New-Hampshire Patriot of March 27, 1851.:

Dinmore Loco Fierce Candidate.	Catholic Emanci- pation.	Dinmore Loco Fierce Candidate.	Catholic Emanci- pation.
Brentwood... 76	11	Sandwich... 113	6
Seabrook... 85	12	Wakefield... 176	1
Widham... 46	7	Wolborough... 279	11
Durham... 155	8	Loudon... 120	12
Farmington... 204	11	Alexandria... 134	12
New-Durham... 113	4	Ellsworth... 59	1
Stafford... 244	12	Hill... 130	11
Chatham... 83	7	Holderness... 153	9
Effingham... 129	1	Mulan... 64	6
Oaspee... 194	12		

A QUESTION.

Ye men of too credulous a disposition, who may have too easily yielded credence to the supposition that a Loco-Foco can tell the truth, compare the above table with the assertions of Geo. M. Dallas and the Loco-Foco party, and what little word will involuntarily flutter on every tongue!

Here is the Loco-Foco town of New Durham, which gave 113 votes for Pierce's pet for Governor, and only four votes for Catholic Emancipation. Yet George M. Dallas and party say that it failed only because the Whigs and Free Soilers combined against it! Here is the Loco-Foco town of Effingham, 129 votes for Pierce's Governor, and only one solitary vote for Catholic Emancipation; Wakefield, with 176 Loco-Focos and only one vote for Catholic Emancipation; and yet, Geo. M. Dallas and his party—his head whitening with blossoms for the grave, once Vice President of the United States, and President of the most distinguished, deliberate elective body in the world—states that the Whigs and Free Soilers defeated a measure, in spite of the exertions of a party which only polled one vote out of 176—one out of 129 of their own party vote for the measure.

What chance has truth of ever rising again, when crushed to earth with such merciless audacity as this? What wonder that letters are forged for General Scott, which he never wrote, when

"Falsehood puts on the face of simple truth,
And masks in the habit of plain honesty,
When she intends most villainy."

THE VOTE AGAIN.

The vote in the whole State was, for Dinmore, (Pierce's candidate).....24,425
For Sawyer, (Whig).....18,458
For Atwood, (Free Sol).....12,049

Atwood had been the regularly nominated Loco-Foco candidate; and so the two Loco-Focos carried 36,474, a majority of about two-thirds over the Whig vote. And yet the vote on the Constitution was:

For Catholic Emancipation.....13,575
Against it.....24,971

It must be remarked that, in this vote, as in 1852, the great majority of those who voted for Catholic Emanci-

pation were Whigs. Indeed, the vote against Catholic Emancipation is just about the vote which was cast for Pierce's candidate for Governor.

THE CONVENTION REASSEMBLES.

The Convention reassembled on the 16th of April, 1852,—and here we meet with more Loco-Foco forgery and falsehood.

A SLANDER REFUTED.

Mr. Chamberlain, the Whig candidate for Governor, and a warm friend of Catholic Emancipation, was in favor of having the Convention adjourn, and therefore opposed the proposition to submit any further amendments to the people. The people had become so exasperated with the Convention, and tired of its deliberations, that Mr. Chamberlain said it would ruin the chance for Catholic Emancipation for a century, to crowd it back upon them then; but this was what the Loco-Foco party seemed to want, to do up the business at once, so as forever to exclude other chances of future redress to Catholics; and because Mr. Chamberlain thus spoke, he has been accused of opposing Catholic Emancipation, whereas he voted for it in all its stages, and when (contrary to his advice) the subject was forced upon the people again, at the next election—when, as he foretold, it was voted down, receiving about 4,000 votes less than the previous year—the town in which he lived (Keene) did not give a single vote against it, but gave 217 votes for it. This the slanderers of Mr. Chamberlain know. *The Concord Patriot*, of Jan. 3, 1851, says that "it was a grave question whether the Convention have the authority to make any further amendments after those now made shall have been acted upon by the people." And yet now they abuse and slander Mr. Chamberlain for taking the correct view of this grave question.

NEW DISCUSSION ON THE TEST.

Well, the Convention was two days in session, (June 16 and 17,) and in that time speeches were made upon this Catholic Emancipation by Messrs. Smith, Chamberlain, Bell, Eastman, Woodbury, &c., &c.; but not one word did Franklin Pierce say during the whole time.

GOV. DINSMORE'S MESSAGE.

Nor is this all. In June, 1851, the Legislature assembled, and Pierce's candidate being elected Governor, delivered his message to the Legislature. If Franklin Pierce had asked him to put in a paragraph expressing regret at the failure of the last trial, and urging support in the new trial ordered, he would undoubtedly have done it—but no, in place of any such thing we have the following paragraph rejoicing over the defeat of Catholic Emancipation, which was undoubtedly seen and approved by Mr. Pierce before it was delivered:

"It is apparent from this decisive expression (says Gov. Dinsmore) of the popular will, that the present Constitution is, in the main, entirely satisfactory to a large majority of the people. * * * This result also indicates the instructive lesson which may be useful for our guidance hereafter, that no material or important amendments to the Constitution can be expected to find acceptance with the people, which is anything more than declaratory of their known sentiments; and that it is always unsafe to assume a knowledge of their opinions when they have not been distinctly pronounced. * * * An occasional examination and discussion of the principles and forms of the fundamental law, are not without their use, if they serve no other purpose than to bring more clearly to view the great merits of our old and well tried Constitution, and to give the people another opportunity to reaffirm their strong and unabated attachment to it." (Dinsmore's Message, June, 1851.)

If that is not a direct approval of the people in rejecting Catholic emancipation, then I am ignorant of what language means.

LOCO-FOCO STATE CONVENTION.

In the same month (June, 1851,) the Loco-Focos of New Hampshire held a State Convention at Concord, to nominate candidates for State officers to be elected the following March, when the Anti-Catholic test was to be tried again. This Convention passed a series of resolutions rejoicing in the defeat of Catholic emancipation. Here is the first resolution:

Resolved, That the representatives of the people, in Convention assembled, congratulate each other upon the signal triumph of the Democracy of New Hampshire over all the former combinations of hostile forces, with which they have been obliged to contend in the recent State election. That we behold with pride and joyful satisfaction the Demo-

cratic party coming out from the midst of the perils which encompassed it, victorious over the unity of open foes and the treachery of supposed friends, its strength unimpaired, its dignity uncompromised, its honor untarnished, and its fundamental doctrines unchanged.

Now here we have the whole Loco-Foco Pierce Party of New-Hampshire represented in State Convention, and taking counsel of Franklin Pierce at Concord, just after the defeat of Catholic Emancipation at the previous election, and just after a new set of amendments had been ordered to be submitted to the people at the same time when their candidates would be voted for; and yet in their long string of resolutions on almost every subject, they found not room for a single word in favor of Catholic Emancipation, but rejoiced that their fundamental doctrines had been unchanged.

THE DEMOCRAT ON PIERCE & CO.

Indeed so well known was it that Franklin Pierce and his party were opposed to Catholic Emancipation, that *The Concord Democrat*, published in his own city, and of course read by him, in a conspicuous editorial, published June 12, 1851, says:

"The failure of that Convention is directly traceable to those Hunker leaders, Pierce, Advertiser & Co., who were determined that it should either be entirely subservient to their partisan views, or be what it was, an abortion. They succeeded, and to them belongs the honor."

NOTHING DONE.

Well, from April, 1851 to March, 1852, Catholic Emancipation was before the people of the State. Yet during that period of eleven months, Franklin Pierce never opened his mouth in favor of the measure. Neither he nor his friends called any public meeting to advocate it. They saw that it had been voted down, two to one, the last election, and that, therefore, it was incumbent on every friend of liberal sentiments to bend every energy in its favor. During that time any quantity of resolutions were drawn up and passed on abstract questions; hundreds of meetings held, and the very air loaded with unmeaning glorifications of "Democracy," yet during that whole time no meeting, no resolution, no speech for Catholic Emancipation.

THE QUESTION AGAIN SUBMITTED.

Well, March 1852 approached. The regular Loco-Foco candidate for Governor had committed suicide, and the Pierce party nominated Noah Martin for the post thus made vacant. The election was held for State officers. At the same time, three simple amendments to the Constitution were submitted to the people. The first was for Catholic Emancipation. The second was for abolishing Property Qualifications, and the third, an easier mode for future amendments. The first amendment reads as follows:

1. Resolved, That no belief in the doctrines of any particular religious sect, shall be required as a test for holding office, or be entitled to any preference whatever, under the Constitution. And this amendment shall be effected by striking from it, in Part 2d, section 14th, the words "shall be of the Protestant religion;" and from section 29th the words "Who is not of the Protestant religion; and from section 42d the words "and unless he shall be of the Protestant religion;" and in the Bill of Rights, article 6th, the word "Protestant."

The following is the result, by Counties, throughout the State:

THE VOTE by Counties on Governor, and also on striking out the Anti-Catholic Test in the Constitution, in March, 1852.

FOR GOVERNOR.		FOR CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.	
Counties.	Martin, (Pierce Cand.)	Ynys.	Nays.
Rockingham.....	4,669.....	1,374	1,856
Stratford.....	2,381.....	764	852
Belknap.....	2,155.....	323	1,037
Carroll.....	2,239.....	257	1,101
Merrimack.....	4,614.....	1,163	2,455
Hillsborough.....	4,550.....	1,457	1,800
Cheshire.....	2,338.....	1,322	716
Sullivan.....	2,074.....	1,030	660
Grafton.....	4,404.....	1,317	1,758
Cocchos.....	1,575.....	559	357
Total.....	30,999.....	9,566	12,092

It will be remembered that Catholic Emancipation, which was before submitted in the same amendment with the Property Qualification, was here submitted alone, and, as Mr. Chamberlain and other true friends of the measure had foretold, was here worse defeated

than before. And the Property Qualification, when relieved from the burden of Catholic toleration, was carried by two-thirds, and will be in force as part of the Constitution as soon as the Governor issues his proclamation announcing the fact. This he should have done in June last, but his New-Hampshire Loco-Focoism seems to regret that property should not continue to make the map, and therefore he is silent hitherto.

But though the amendment to abolish all property qualification was repealed, Catholic Emancipation had fewer votes than it had one year before. In 1851 it had 13,575 votes, and in 1852 it had only 9,566. By forcing it upon the people again too soon, in spite of Mr. Chamberlain's wise counsel, and by separating it from the property qualification, it has received such a fall, that the friends of Catholic Emancipation in New-Hampshire hesitate not to say, that there is no chance of its passing for fifty or a hundred years, if Pierce is not defeated.

But the hand of Providence sometimes works mysteriously. A set of wire-pullers have put up for President of the United States the leader of New-Hampshire Loco-Focoism, perhaps the most bigoted and brutal lump of stupidity in the Universe. The question of Catholic Emancipation comes up on appeal from the "Democracy" of New-Hampshire to the People of the United States. Every man who votes for Pierce, votes for his party, and votes to fasten the stigma forever on the Catholics. Those that vote against him, vote for Catholic Emancipation. That's just the question at the next election.

Well, now, in place of it being defeated for want of a two-third vote, Catholic Emancipation did not receive one-sixth of the vote cast for Governor. The vote for Emancipation throughout the State was only 9,566, and of these I do not think more than about 2,000 were of Pierce's party. I appeal to the Record.

CURIOUS TABLES—LOCO VOTE.

I give a table of Loco-Foco towns, compared with a similar table of Whig towns, and show the vote for the respective candidates for Governor, and the Yeas and Nays on Catholic Emancipation:

	Yeas.	Nays.	Martin.
Auburn	1	17	83
Newmarket	20	100	205
Newton	8	70	89
North wood	1	86	152
Nottingham	13	75	140
Lee	35	67	165
New-Durham	3	60	135
Alton	24	125	221
Barnstead	45	175	349
Gilmanston	20	209	363
Albany	2	60	56
Brookfield	5	60	69
Conway	21	110	195
Effingham	10	83	145
Wolborough	1	135	291
Chichester	3	174	149
Epsom	6	108	173
London	4	180	171
Warner	22	157	250
Hillsborough	15	101	234
Pelham	13	73	115
Goshen	7	118	100
Bethlehem	2	73	106
Ellsworth	1	48	58
Franconia	11	64	59
Hill	2	114	133
Landaff	25	113	140
Woodstock	2	63	69
Berlin	3	36	38
Stark	1	49	47
Jackson	14	63	87
Totals	340	2,966	4,797

So strongly Loco-Foco are these thirty-one towns, that they sent to the Legislature, in 1852, 37 Loco-Foco Representatives, and not a single Whig.

These figures I have from the official record in the office of the Secretary of State at Concord; and here we see that in 31 towns, which gave Pierce's candidate 4,797 votes, only 340 votes were raised for Catholic Emancipation, and 2,966 votes were given against it. That is, not one-twelfth of the votes given for Martin were given for Catholic Emancipation, saying nothing

at all about the Whig votes cast in these towns for Catholic Emancipation. In some of these towns the Whig vote is very small, being just about the number given for Catholic Emancipation. Thus there were in

Whig votes.	For Emancipation.
Barnstead	51
Franconia	18
Landaff	35
Barnstead	51
Franconia	11
Landaff	25

And so far from it being the fact that it was Whigs only that voted against it, we have these facts, that in the town of

Whig votes.	Against Emancipation.
Newton	29
Nottingham	20
Lee	10
Barnstead	51
Brookfield	16
Effingham	30
Charlestown	28
Warren	34
Ellsworth	0
Newton	70
Nottingham	75
Lee	67
Barnstead	175
Brookfield	60
Effingham	83
Charlestown	174
Warren	157
Ellsworth	48

In this last town of Ellsworth, there were only 8 Free Soil votes, and no Whig votes, and yet there were 48 votes against Catholic Emancipation, and only one vote for it; and yet Geo. M. Dallas, and all Loco-Foco speakers and writers, tell us it was the combination of this nought and eight that prevented the solitary one being two-thirds of the whole vote cast!

THE WHIG TOWNS.

Now let us see what the Whig towns did. I give the votes for and against Catholic Emancipation, and the vote at the same election for Sawyer, the Whig candidate for Governor:

Towns.	Yeas.	Nays.	Sawyer.
Epping	95	25	117
Exeter	39	12	321
Dover	472	230	723
Somersworth	123	36	354
Wilton	100	1	70
Fitzwilliam	145	27	140
Keene	217	0	374
Marlborough	62	4	83
Roxbury	24	7	37
Troy	54	9	77
Winchester	122	0	200
Charlestown	66	3	164
Claremont	167	67	306
Cornish	126	45	114
Croydon	104	17	41
Langdon	32	1	55
Haverhill	106	48	205
Littleton	94	32	173
Portsmouth	533	237	601
Totals	2,681	791	4,135

The above 19 towns are entitled to 41 Representatives, and but two of those elected to the Legislature in 1852 were Pierce men, and these two came from Portsmouth, where about one-third of all the Nays were given.

COMPARISONS.

Here, then, we have 19 Whig towns giving 4,135 votes for Whig Governor, and rolling up 2,681 votes for Catholic Emancipation, and only 791 votes against it—giving, in fact, in this small Whig portion of the State, more than one-fourth of all the votes cast for Catholic Emancipation throughout the State. In Keene, where Mr. Chamberlain, who is so much abused and belied, lived and voted, there are 217 votes for Catholic Emancipation, and not one against it. In Concord, where Franklin Pierce lives, there were 360 votes against it and only 256 for it. And look at Cheshire, the only Whig County in the State, and in which Keene is situated, and in that Whig County—Mr. Chamberlain's residence—there were 1,322 votes for Catholic Emancipation, and only 716 against it; while in the Loco-Foco County of Merrimack, where Mr. Pierce resides, and where 4,614 voted for Pierce's candidate for Governor, there were only 1,163 votes for Catholic Emancipation, and 2,455 against it.

I know that, to adduce more evidence to prove that the whole Loco-Foco arguments are unmitigated falsehoods, would be to waste words and abuse patience—and, therefore, I shall only give one more table, which I have copied from the official records in the office of the

Secretary of State at Concord. I give a list of 42 towns, not one of which gave a baker's dozen for Catholic Emancipation, while they could muster in large numbers for Pierce's candidate for Governor, whose vote I also give. Just look at the record:

THIS AND THAT TOGETHER.

BOCHINGHAM COUNTY.					
Towns.	For Martin.	For Catholic Emanci- pation.	Towns.	For Martin.	For Catholic Emanci- pation.
Auburn.....	83	1	Newton.....	89	8
Brentwood.....	64	0	Northwood.....	152	1
Chester.....	133	7	Poplin.....	54	9
Hampton Falls..	55	7	Winham.....	47	7
Newcastle.....	75	8			

STRAFFORD COUNTY.

Durham.....	186	5	New Durham..	135	3
Madbury.....	48	0			

BELKNAP COUNTY.

New Hampton	141	11			
-------------	-----	----	--	--	--

CARROLL COUNTY.

Albany.....	56	2	Ellingham....	145	10
Brookfield.....	69	5	Wolborough...	291	1

MERRIMACK COUNTY.

Canterbury....	147	9	Loudon.....	171	4
Chichester....	149	3	Pittsfield.....	228	0
Epsum.....	173	6			

HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY.

Badford.....	147	9	Mount Vernon..	80	10
Manchester Wrd 1.	40	1	Sharon.....	38	5
" " 6.102	0	0	Windsor.....	34	5

CHESHIRE COUNTY.

Hinsdale.....	76	7	Rindge.....	41	1
---------------	----	---	-------------	----	---

SULLIVAN COUNTY.

Goshen.....	100	7	Washington....	98	4
-------------	-----	---	----------------	----	---

GRAFTON COUNTY.

Benton.....	76	5	Grafton.....	121	5
Bethlehem....	106	2	Hill.....	133	2
Ellsworth....	58	1	Woodstock....	69	2
Franconia....	59	11			

COOS COUNTY.

Berlin.....	38	3	Stark.....	47	1
Randolph....	19	7			

MORE COMPARISONS.

Fellow-citizens, look at this, and then look at Mr. Dallas and the false public opinion which his speech has created throughout the country. Brentwood could muster 64 for Pierce's Governor, but *not one* for Catholic Emancipation; Northwood 152 for Pierce's Governor, and *only one* for Catholic Emancipation; Madbury 48 for Pierce's Governor, and *not one* for Emancipation; Wolborough 291 for Pierce's candidate, and *only one* for Emancipation; Pittsfield 228 for Pierce's Governor, and *not one* for Emancipation. And yet we are told that it was only a combination of Whigs and Free-Soilers that prevented the hosts of Loco-Focoism carrying Catholic Emancipation! Did any one ever suppose that fallen man had fallen so low as to utter statements so shamefully false?

JUST LOOK AT IT.

And there is the sickening outline of the Constitutional history of New-Hampshire. Throughout that whole history Franklin Pierce and Benjamin Pierce were leading men in the State, filling the highest offices, and controlling party organizations. Benjamin Pierce fastened the stigma on the Catholics; and Franklin Pierce gave himself no trouble to remove it—not so much as a humane man would undergo to save a blind puppy from drowning in a pond.

Will any one who has not yet abandoned all belief in veracity, look at these facts and compare them with the arguments put and kept aloft by Loco-Foco speakers and writers, from Dallas to Medary, up or down, if from the lowest depths you can ascend or fall; and hear them all talk of the eloquence, energy and toll with which Franklin Pierce contended for Emancipation, and that he and his party were only prevented from carrying it because the party were not able to get two-thirds of the votes over the Whigs and Free-Soilers, when it is a fact that Franklin Pierce never opened his mouth upon the subject when the question was up for discus-

sion, and that not one-tenth of the votes cast for Pierce's candidate for Governor voted for Emancipation, and that even if, with the above comparison of Whig and Loco-Foco towns before us, we should grant that one-half of the votes cast for Catholic Emancipation were given by the Pierce party, still these figures would show that the Loco-Foco vote for Emancipation was only 4,783, while at the same election, the same party polled 30,999 votes for Martin, their Pierce candidate for Governor. Alas! "How this world is given to lying!"

OTHER TOPICS.

There are many thoughts crowding upon me, to which I should like to give expression, but I have already detained you too long; and I want to say a word upon some other acts of the Pierce Loco-Locho party of New-Hampshire, and one or two words more on Charles O'Connor's favorite antecedent, Benjamin Pierce, from whose veins Franklin draws his Democratic blood.

ALIEN AND SEDITION LAWS.

On June 6, 1798, the New-Hampshire Legislature met at Hopkinton. Benjamin Pierce, Franklin's father, was a member from Hillsborough. John Taylor Gilman was declared elected Governor. Benjamin Pierce was one of the Committee appointed to wait on the Governor.

June 7, Joshua Heywood was appointed Chaplain.

A MINISTER SILENCED.

It will be recollected that this was during old John Adams's Administration, when the "Alien and Sedition Laws," "Federalism," &c., &c., agitated the country.

June 8, I find this record "voted that, in consequence of certain expressions used by Mr. Heywood, in his prayer in the House, and his omitting to pray for the President and Congress of the United States, this day, that this House do not wish any further services from him as Chaplain; and that the Assistant be directed to furnish him with a copy thereof." This passed unanimously. And thus, because this honest old Republican preacher refused to insult Heaven, and to pray for the authors of the Alien and Sedition Law, Benjamin Pierce voted to insult and starve him.

Was it for this that Charles O'Connor praised the "antecedent?"

June 11, Gov. Gilman delivered his message, in which he eulogized Adams, and denounced Foreign Agents, &c. The address in reply to "the throne," echoing the above sentiments, was adopted June 14, and Benjamin Pierce voted for it.

June 16, an Address to the President of the United States (John Adams) was adopted, which says:

"Permit us, Sir, to express our entire satisfaction in the wisdom and energy of your Administration. * * * It is with pleasure we contemplate the increasing firmness of our National Legislature. * * * The opposition in the State of New-Hampshire to the Administration of the Federal Government is much too contemptible to merit the name of division. * * * Accept, Sir, our united declarations to support and defend the constituted authorities of our country with our lives and fortunes. * * * Long may you continue to watch over the safety of the community."

Signed by 134 names, and among them Benjamin Pierce, Mr. O'Connor's beau ideal "antecedent."

There were four ways to the address—Messrs. Langdon, Drowne, Bartlett and Sanborn.

NATIONAL NATIVISM.

In the same year, (Nov. 24, 1798,) a Committee was appointed by the Legislature to petition Congress to alter the Constitution of the United States, respecting qualification for Members of the Legislature (Congress) of the United States. That Committee reported Dec. 26, 1798, recommending that none but natural-born citizens of the United States should be eligible to the Vice-Presidency as well as the Presidency, and recommending also to "exclude from a seat in either branch of Congress, any person who shall not have been actually naturalized at the time of making this amendment, and have been admitted a citizen fourteen years at least at the time of such election."

That piece of ultra Nativism, which would turn Gen. Shields and Mr. Soule out of our present Senate, passed the New-Hampshire Legislature, with Pierce's vote, and won for him the admiration of the Democracy of this

day and the endorsement of Charles O'Connor; and that, too, was passed about the time that Emmet, Sampson, O'Connor, (Charles's father,) and MacNevin were expected in this country. Indeed, pretty much all the vindictive kind of Nativism and bigotry in our country, had their origin among the leaders and fathers of New-Hampshire Loco-Focoism.

June 5, 1799, the Legislature met at Concord—Mr. Pierce again a Member from Hillsborough. Governor Gilman's message again denounced foreigners and appealed to native citizens to defend Adams. He denounced the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799, (recently endorsed by the Baltimore Loco-Foco platform.) An address echoing these sentiments was carried in the Legislature—*Benjamin Pierce* voting for the address.

ALIEN LAWS INDORSED.

June 14, 1799, a series of resolution in favor of the *Alien and Sedition laws* were introduced into the New-Hampshire Legislature. One of them was in these words:

"That if the Legislature of New-Hampshire, for mere speculative purposes, were to express an opinion on the acts of the General Government, commonly called 'The Alien and Sedition Bills,' that opinion would necessarily be that *these acts were constitutional, and in the present situation of our country, highly expedient.*"

Passed: 137 recorded for it, and among them Mr. O'Connor's pet, Pierce.

JOHN ADAMS INDORSED.

In June, 1827, Benjamin Pierce, as Governor of New-Hampshire, sent in his message to the Legislature. We are told by the Loco-Foco presses that Franklin Pierce wrote his father's messages. We have already made one extract from this message. I quote again some sections extolling old John Adams, whose Alien and Sedition laws were so popular in New-Hampshire.

Benjamin (or rather Franklin) Pierce, says that old John Adams was one of the "most consistent patriots and ablest men whose names have graced the annals of any age," and that the memory of Adams "will continue dear as our freedom, and lasting as our Republic;" that his "fame, not acquired by a single enterprise, but gained by the active and ardent exertions of a long life devoted to the cause of liberty, will continue to increase with the diffusion of liberal principles."

PIERCE OPPOSED TO GEN. JACKSON.

In 1829, Benjamin Pierce was again Governor, and Franklin Pierce was a member of the Legislature from Hillsborough. The father and son had the lead in party matters in the State, and long before that time, and ever since, managed things pretty much as they pleased.—In 1824 and 1828, Gen. Jackson was up for President, and we have it on the authority of Isaac Hill, Loco Foco Governor of New Hampshire, that Franklin Pierce caused his father to take sides against Jackson. At all events New-Hampshire went at both elections *against* Gen. Jackson. I presume Franklin had very little trouble in bringing Ben over, as he had originally been a "Federalist," and in favor of Alien and Sedition laws, Anti-Catholic tests, and such New-Hampshire Loco-Foco amusements as were instilled into Franklin in his youth.

PIERCE'S FAMILY.

We are told that Pierce is of an Irish family. This is another falsehood. In a life of Franklin Pierce, in *The New-York Herald* of June 9, and endorsed by Charles O'Connor in Tammany Hall the same evening, we are told that Benjamin Pierce "was born at Chelmsford, a town near Lowell, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in 1757." "He was descended from a respectable Irish family, who originally emigrated along with many other Irish emigrants from Londonderry, in the North of Ireland, and settled in New-Londonderry, New-Hampshire." The simplicity of this falsehood may be seen at a glance, when we remember that the Londonderry settlement left Ireland only in 1718, which was less than thirty years before Benjamin Pierce was born, and his father was an old resident of Chelmsford, where no Londonderry or Irish settlement ever was made. Nor is the name of Pierce found in the list of the Londonderry colony. On a monument in the Woburn, (Mass.,) burying ground, near Chelmsford, I find "Benjamin Pierce, died 1713," who most likely was Governor Ben-

jamin Pierce's grandfather, and died in Massachusetts near five years before the Londonderry colony left Ireland.

The truth is simply that Franklin Pierce is descended from an old English family, and will, therefore, be the more acceptable to those who think that nothing but Anglo-Saxon mind should rule in this country, and that a distinguished Celt, like General Winfield Scott, descended from Scotch ancestors, a people of a common origin with the Irish, has no business to expect honors here.

God forbid that I should condemn a man on account of his own birth-place; much less on account of the birth-place of his father. Far be it from me to hold a man responsible for the acts of his father. Far be it from me to needlessly insult the memory of old Revolutionary John Adams; but when the Loco-Focos mount us with being descendants of the Federalists, we may well remind them that the father of their leader was one. When they ring the changes on Alien and Sedition Laws, we may tell them that the father of their candidate voted for them, and stands recorded while the Republic shall last, as voting for them; and when they tell us the falsehood, so clumsy and transparent, that the Pierces of Chelmsford and Woburn, in Massachusetts, were the posterity of the Londonderry settlement, we may be permitted to tell them that Sir Boyle Roach long ago informed such blockheads that posterity could not possibly mean those that preceded us! In fact, the friends of Pierce, finding that a majority of the American people, born in the country, intend to go for Scott, hope to carry some naturalized citizens to vote against their best friend; and they think no falsehood too ridiculous, no humbug too transparent to deceive us. We thank them for their compliments, but we have our eye-teeth cut, and we can judge between right and wrong, truth and falsehood.

ANOTHER INSULT TO IRISHMEN.

There is one other New-Hampshire Loco-Foco insult to Irishmen to which I wish to refer. In the Spring Election of 1833, the Pierce party of Concord were afraid that they might lose the town of Concord in the election of some Municipal officers. So they ruled that the foreign-born inhabitants should be allowed to vote for town officers, whether they were naturalized or not. Accordingly some 23 Irishmen were admitted to vote, but 17 out of the 23 voted with the Whigs, to show their contempt of the Pierce party, that had so long oppressed and insulted them.

The Pierce party grew so infuriated at this, that they passed a bill, that very year, "to regulate the right of suffrage," and the following is Section 2, in full, which I copied from the official records:

"Sec 2. And be it further enacted, That no Alien shall be entitled to vote at any town meeting."

This law was passed, and the record stands thus:

"Approved, July 4, 1833. ISAAC HILL."

W. L. MARCY AND THE BAMBERS.

I had intended to dwell on the insult offered the Naturalized citizens of this State by the Loco-Foco Delegates from this State, with others, who voted for William L. Marcy, who gave up the Bangers to the tender mercies of Great Britain, when he was Governor. If Washington Hunt should now seize Thomas Francis Meagher and hand him over to the British Consul, and the Whigs should then nominate, or vote for him, for President, we would hear some Loco-Foco music; but this is what the Loco-Focos did to us with W. L. Marcy!

"OLD CHIPPEWA."

And now, fellow-citizens, here I am at the end of my time and your patience, and not a word about "Old Chippewa" and "Churubusco." I must only reserve my fire on that subject for some other occasion. I can only say that all efforts to misrepresent him to the naturalized citizens of this country will fail.

FORGERIES.

The letter which they attribute to him as written to Geo. W. Reed, I know—those that publish it know it to be a forgery. I have, for several weeks past, had put up fifty dollars on the truth of my assertion that it is a forgery. They have sent deputations to Geo. W. Reed, and they have failed to get or to produce one particle of evidence from him that Scott ever wrote that letter.—They haul up some old anonymous article signed

"American," said to be written eight or ten years ago, and attribute it to Gen. Scott.

Now, why all this nonsense? Who cares to know that about the same number of years since, Smith O'Brien was a Tory? All his friends are contented with his position now, except the bonds and exile he is wearing and enduring, as badges of his fidelity and devotion to his countrymen.

WHAT THEY KNOW.

Do they not know that Gen. Scott, four years ago, in replying to the welcome of the Common Council of the City of New-York, boldly declared his friendship for the naturalized citizens?

Do they not know that in 1848 he wrote a letter, which is published in all his biographies, in which he declares: "Certainly it would be impossible for me to recommend or support any measure intended to exclude them (the naturalized citizens) from a just and full participation in all civil and political rights now secured to them by our Republican laws and institutions."

Do they not know that Gen. Scott is now in favor of giving such foreign-born subjects as serve one year in the army or navy, the right to vote, in addition to the privileges already enjoyed, and having the general naturalization laws remain as they are? To their disgrace, be it said, the Loco-Focos are opposing this measure, though they must know that hundreds of gallant Germans and Irish, who had fought through the Mexican War, covering themselves and their country with glory, returned to the land for whose safety they had fought, and could not approach the ballot-box to vote for those who are to manage the Government of their country.

Do they not know that Gen. Scott has borne testimony to the fidelity and valor of the Irish, Germans, &c., "in maintaining our flag in the face of every danger," and that in his letter to Robert Tyler, of Philadelphia, and others who invited him to the celebration of St. Patrick's Day in that city, he replied, speaking of the naturalized citizens:

"Many of them marched and fought under my command in the War of 1812-15, and many more—thousands—in the recent war with Mexico, not one of whom was ever known to turn his back upon the enemy or a friend."

The Loco-Foco party presses, to their disgrace be it told, tried to prevent the circulation of this testimony, so honorable to our naturalized soldiery—testimony, too, which is supported by letters written by Richard M. Johnson, Zachary Taylor, and others; and further to the shame, and I hope to the confusion of the Loco-Foco party, be it said, they reply with the slander, that the Irish deserted the American flag, and were hanged as traitors. But I have not time nor patience to deal with this Loco-Foco slander as it deserves.

WHO FOR SCOTT?

Fellow-citizens, General Scott commends himself to the support of all sects, sections and parties of our country. Since George Washington, no man has done so much for his country as Winfield Scott. His blood, on our Northern borders, rescued Michigan and other portions of our Territory from being what else it might have been—British Territory. The gold, and riches, and wide Territory of California, (millions of gold flowing monthly into our port,) are the benefits he purchased for us by his unparalleled military conquests in Mexico. That flag of England which has waved, the emblem of tyranny over Ireland for seven centuries—which now flaps its sullen folds over O'Brien and Mitchell in Van Dieman's Land—General Scott pulled down and trampled in the dust at Fort George. When the Irish soldiers under him were taken prisoners at Queenstown, and were about to be sent to England to be hanged as traitors, he stood between them and destruction, and by holding an Englishman's life as forfeit for every Irishman's, he saved them from destruction. When he marched over Mexico, in a career of glorious achievements, his dispatches before the battles, becoming histories of the victories, his course was marked with so much wise statesmanship, such enlarged and enlightened toleration to the opinions and religious peculiarities of the people, that terror for the conqueror swelled into love for the benefactor, and a whole nation, whose fortress, one by one, surrendered to his sword, finally yielded their hearts a tribute of homage to his humanity.

"How shall we rank thee upon glory's page,
Thou more than Conqueror?"

And shall this man be forgotten or left to die without any mark of the people's gratitude? Shall he carry to his grave the British lead which he received at Lundy's Lane, and receive no weightier acknowledgement of a people's gratitude? Had America elected Aaron Burr over George Washington, as first President, or should Ireland become a Republic, and some Peter Brown or John Smith defeat John Mitchell or Smith O'Brien, in a contest for the Presidency, we would vent our indignation in language which shall be but history's echo on us as a nation, if we elect Franklin Pierce over Winfield Scott.

HIS ELECTION CERTAIN.

But I have no fear of General Scott's triumphant election. My great anxiety is that the naturalized citizens should not be put in a position now, similar to that which they were cheated into in 1844, by voting for Mr. Polk against Henry Clay. I believe that at the next election will be polled about three millions of votes. The whole naturalized vote throughout the States will be about a quarter of a million. Of the native born voters of the United States, I believe General Scott will get one million six hundred thousand, so that he is sure of an election. If the vote in the several States be distributed as it has been heretofore; but it is my desire that my countrymen should go for a great American, with a great majority, rather than to be eternally upholding little men for smaller factions. And why should any liberal naturalized citizen vote for Franklin Pierce, the candidate of *The London Times*, which calls our Irish people half-civilized savages, their religion mummery, (as it is called by the Pierce party in New-Hampshire,) and their priesthood suppurated ruffians? Why should naturalized citizens here begin to wear British manufactures, to enable the British Government to keep their country in misery, and their patriots in chains? Why not vote for the Whigs, with Protection to Home Industry against British Capital? For internal improvements, where honest poverty may get from the Treasury a part of the hoarded treasures which Loco Focism watches with a miser's care, or expends only on aristocratic office holders?

OPPOSITION NO USE.

Gentlemen Loco-Focos, your appeals to the naturalized citizens are in vain. If you wish to kill Gen. Scott you must appeal to your friends of England, and not to the republican naturalized citizen of this country. If Scott, the only man living who, with his own hands, in a fair stand up fight, tore down the British flag, is to be hanged to appease the offended wrath of England, you must appeal to some other nation than Ireland—Irishmen would rather furnish other victims to the scaffold than become the executioner.

You cannot tear from the popular breast the maternal love for the children of its pride. Nor can you get the people to support the idols set up by the Herods of the Baltimore Convention, whose hands are yet reeking with the blood of the slaughtered Loco-Foco Innocents. Michigan is leaning on her broken sword; Pennsylvania is pouring from her veins the last drop of Democratic blood; Illinois is straining her eyes through the magnifying glass by which she had fondly manufactured a giant out of a Douglass; New-York is covered with sackcloth and patches, at her unmerciful condition. All these, joined with Kentucky, Indiana, and other disconsolate mothers, are shedding tears sufficient to create a freshet in Salt River, weeping for their children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not!

No, gentlemen, no, you cannot defeat Gen. WINFIELD SCOTT. Nay, all the leaders of all the parties in the Union, combined against him, could not defeat him. Your Hulla may surrender, and your Casses may break their swords on a Michigan stump in place of an Englishman, but "Old Chippewa" is onward and upward, like the flight of our eagle, and the destiny of our Republic. Your Pillows may throw up fortifications on the wrong side of the ditch, and your Pierces may faint or fall, (I charge no man with cowardice.) I repeat, they may faint or fall, whether from the nature of the horse or the fault of the animal on his back, but the hand that tore down the British flag at Fort George, whose finger was the index to glory at Lundy's Lane and Churubusco, will gather from the field of American gratitude a rich harvest of honor. Leaders and organs may falter or betray, but People, all of whom can think as well as

any would-be leaders, reposing confidence in the hero of three wars, and the statesman of three great epochs in our history, will carry him in their arms to political victory. He has turned civil strife into new incentives of union; and from the fields where defeat and disgrace foretold destruction, at his command the bird of victory has risen Phoenix-like for a nobler flight. His victories have been like those of Scipio Africanus—all won outside of our borders. Before the enemy could invade our territory he strewed their bones upon their own. Along our Northern frontier he made the enemy's own soil the scene of American victory. And southward, under the blaze of a tropical sun, the shining track of his victorious sword is a flaming guardian outside our Southern borders, telling to every foe that every foot of our Union, between Chippewa and Chepultepec, are sacred to union and happiness, and free from invasion and desecration. His is the military glory of a Caesar, and the civic virtues of a Cincinnatus. His the combined wisdom of that old Celtic king which rendered the name of Brian Borlome an expression capable of the double meaning of surpassing military genius and unequalled civic sagacity.

The scintillations shaken from his glittering sword have given light to the beams of battle sufficient to eclipse the glory of a hundred such military achievements as those ever won by a Pierce or a Pillow. While the men who are now opposing him—with or without the Presidency—shall sink into historic gloom, or rather fade from historic light, General Scott—with or without the Presidency—shall shine as a sun in the perpetual firmament of his country's glory. And whether in victory or defeat, ambition enough shall it be for me, (even should my advocacy of General Scott forfeit the friendship of some who would befriend me but for my politics,) to have sustained that arm which pulled down the felon flag of the oppressor of my native land, and whipped the British lion back to his lair, to growl over his defeat. Enough for me to see rise along the vista of the future, the monuments which all future generations of American citizens will gaze upon with pride, and to know that it is not my fault if they shall not read upon that pure and lofty shaft, which will yet rise to his memory,

President.....WINFIELD SCOTT.

IRISH AMERICANS.

There are at least half a million citizens of this country who were born in Ireland, nine tenths of them intensely hostile to British supremacy over their native isle, and regarding that supremacy, with its natural consequences, as among the main sources of Ireland's unparalleled misery and degradation. Their hearts still beat in unison with those of the National party 'at home,' whose orators and journalists, with the entire sympathy and hearty assent of the masses, regard the industrial and commercial subordination of Ireland to England as among the direst consequences of the fatal Act of Union by which their native land was deprived of all independent and substantive existence. These call on their countrymen to encourage Home Manufactures and Home Products as among the most effective and essential means of recovering their national existence. They explain to them, ably and lucidly, that the nominal cheapness of British fabrics in Irish markets is fallacious and deceptive; that Ireland might fabricate quite as cheaply for herself if her people would unite in preferring Irish fabrics; that by so doing they would quadruple their ability to purchase and pay for goods, by enlarging the demand for and reward of their own labor and signally increasing the efficiency of that labor. They demand an Irish Parliament to legislate for Irish interests and Irish industry. In short, the National party in Ireland, (in which term we include both the "Old" and "Young" sections, the followers of O'Connell and those of John Mitchell,) take essentially the same view of national economy that we do, and look to similar means to produce the desired results.

During the agitation preceding the revolutionary effort of 1848, many meetings of the friends of Irish Nationality were held in this city, at one of which the writer hereof presided. A resolution was handed to him while in the chair, pledging every friend of Ireland in America thenceforward to the non-consumption of British manufactures and the discouragement of their use in this country. He objected to put it to the meeting, not as improper or ineffective in itself, but because it would never be lived up to—would, in fact, be only one more added to the innumerable mass of doughy Irish resolves which have supplied John Bull with amusement for the last half century. But all those around him said "Put the resolution," and the meeting clamored for it, and it was put and carried by one unanimous yell of approval. Five thousand Irishmen—born nearly tore the Birmingham buttons off the Lancashire cloth that served them for vests in shouting "Ay!" to the resolution, nine-tenths of whom have worn little else but British cloth ever since, and not only worn it but voted steadily for the policy of keeping this country dependent on Great Britain for the bulk of its fabrics and metals evermore.

We are not the enemy of England. We render full justice to her great qualities and great deeds. We do not doubt that Providence has assigned her a lofty and important career in the future as well as the past. But to that policy which aims to render her the focus and arbiter of the world's industry—the general market of raw staples and the chief supplier of fabrics for other nations—we are intensely hostile, because we believe it at war with Human Progress, with general well-being, and even with the ultimate interest of England herself. We regard that policy as tending to prolong the reign of boorishness and barbarism by keeping the nations ignorant of these arts through which skill is attained, intelligence diffused, knowledge increased, and a just and proper independence realized. We believe that, if Great Britain would take our wool, cotton, flax, hides, wheat, &c., and return them all to us fabricated into clothes, shoes, and bread, charging us nothing for the labor, it would still be a damage to us to have our work so done for nothing, because we ought to understand the making of clothes, shoes, and bread, and do for ourselves. We believe Labor, in the wise Providence of God, not a curse, but a practical blessing—a chief instrument of man's moral, intellectual, and social elevation. But to this end it must be redeemed from the character of mindless drudgery—it must be no perpetual round of iteration and imitation—but a process which calls into play mental as well as physical faculties. The people of Italy, like those of Ireland, are naturally quick-witted, active, enterprising; they are degraded and brutalized in part by the absence of that diversified and comprehensive industry which is essential to a true national life. Belgium has the same religion, no better soil, and is heavily burdened; yet its people are far above the Italians and the Irish in culture, comfort and thrift, because the industry of Belgium is happily diversified, and the surplus products of her admirable agriculture find markets at the farmers' doors in her ample manufactures.

The London Times chronicles the wholesale expatriation of the Irish from Ireland with open complacency and thinly-concealed exultation, seeing that their places will be taken by English and Scotch farmers, whose skill and knowledge, acquired under happier auspices, will enable them to obtain larger crops per acre with less labor, and so pay higher rents to English landlords, and turn off larger surpluses of produce for English markets. Then, the expatriated Irish, says the Times, are not lost. Driven to America by the pressure of famine at home, they earn better wages, and buy more British goods than they were able to procure in their native land. Pat, who could hardly afford to cover his

bones once a year with some three-penny stuff while he lived in Ireland, and jumped at the chance of earning ninepence a day, when transferred to an American Railroad track or embryo Canal, and set to work at a dollar per day, soon clothes himself respectably in woollen, and buys gingham dresses for his wife and children, causing the heart of British Manchester to laugh outright. Bull has a habit of regarding everybody from the shopkeeping point of view, and he finds that every Irishman in America is equal as a customer to three Irishmen in Ireland; so the more he drives into exile, the greater are his trade and profits. But he does not seem to understand that the use of Pat are not all exhausted yet. Seven-eighths of the Irishmen in America have hitherto given their votes and their efforts to sustain the British

manufacturing supremacy in this country. Without those votes, Mr. Clay could not have been defeated in 1844, nor the Tariff cut down in 1846. By these votes, this country was thrown back into the path of Colonial subservience to British ascendancy and British policy. We are sure the voters did not mean this, but such was the tendency; such has been the result.

We have strong faith that the Irish Americans, as a body, will take a different course hereafter. They have at no time meant to be the servitors of British policy; but they have been misled by the specious cry of Democracy into supporting a policy opposed to their own most cherished aspirations. We trust they will act and vote hereafter for that policy which sustains American Labor and American Independence.—*New York Tribune.*

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
305 De Neve Drive - Parking Lot 17 • Box 951388
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90095-1388

Return this material to the library from which it was borrowed.

--	--

Gaylord
PAMPHLET BINDER
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.



3 1205 02576 2517

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 000 942 072 0

Uni
S